

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **30 January 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-9. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Crosland (USPN 6,330,631, hereinafter "Crosland").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by Crosland. The Examiner states that it is not clear from the cited area of the present invention that two portions of a data word are stored in two locations simultaneously.

Applicant respectfully points out that in the present invention, the packet buffer is divided into two sections and data words are loaded in such a way that a write cycle can occur in the same clock cycle to both sections of the packet buffer. Specifically, "the output of a shift register 20, or other means of shifting the bytes in the received line of data, is input to both sections of the packet buffer **in the same clock cycle**" (see FIG. 4, and page 8, lines 1-12 of the instant application). Writing to both locations simultaneously doubles the speed with which the shifted data line is written into the packet buffer (page 8, lines 19-23).

In contrast, Applicant respectfully points out that Crosland teaches writing the output into the accumulator register **in phases**, writing some of the bytes in a first phase and the remaining bytes in a second phase (see Crosland FIG. 12, col. 11, lines 53-67, and col. 12, lines 21-29). Hence, Crosland teaches away from the present invention by writing the output into the accumulator register in phases. The present invention is beneficial because it effectively doubles the speed of writing the shifted data line into the packet buffer as compared to the system of Crosland.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3 and 4 for clarity and to clarify that the present invention simultaneously


writes portions of two data lines in the packet buffer. These amendments find support in FIG. 4, and on page 8, lines 1-23 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 6 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-5, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 7-9, which depend upon claim 6, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date:

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com